



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/556,009

11/08/2005

Johannes Petrus Maria Ansems

NL030699US1

4549

24737

7590

03/30/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

HOLLWEG, THOMAS A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2879

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/30/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/556,009	Applicant(s) ANSEMS ET AL.	
	Examiner Thomas A. Hollweg	Art Unit 2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 5, 2009, has been entered.
2. No claims are cancelled or added. Claims 1-10 are currently pending.
3. The terminal disclaimer filed on December 22, 2009, disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of 10/556003 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 1-2, 5-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tiesler-Wittig, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0031026 A1.
6. With regard to claim 1, in figures 1, 1a, 2 & 2a, Tiesler-Wittig discloses a metal halide lamp (10) for a vehicle headlamp [0001] comprising: a cylindrically-shaped

Art Unit: 2879

discharge vessel (16) along a longitudinal axis, said discharge vessel (16) having a ceramic wall which encloses a discharge space comprising Xe and an ionizable filling, and a cylindrically-shaped outer bulb (20) surrounding the discharge vessel (16) along the longitudinal axis, characterized in that a portion (30) of the surface of the outer bulb (20) facing away from the discharge vessel (16) is shaped as a negative lens [0035-0040] (the sift effect of the lens (30) is a result of at least a portion of the lens being a negative lens).

7. With regard to claim 2, in figures 1, 1a, 2 and 2a, Tiesler-Wittig discloses that the portion (30) with respect to the longitudinal axis encompasses a segment of the outer bulb (20) with a segment angle α in the range between $20 \leq \alpha \leq 110^\circ$ [0036].

8. With regard to claim 5, in figures 1, 1a, 2 and 2a, Tiesler-Wittig discloses that a first and a second portion (30) of the surface of the outer bulb (20) facing away from the discharge vessel (16) are shaped as a negative lens [0040] (the sift effect of the lens (30) is a result of at least a portion of the lens being a negative lens).

9. With regard to claim 6, in figures 1, 1a, 2 and 2a, Tiesler-Wittig discloses that the first and the second portion (30) are at opposite sides of the outer bulb (20).

10. With regard to claim 7, in figures 1, 1a, 2 and 2a, Tiesler-Wittig discloses that the transition between the first portion (30) and the remainder of the outer bulb (20) defines a first plane, in that the transition between the second portion (30) and the remainder of the outer bulb (20) defines a second plane, and in that the first plane and the second plane make an angle with respect to each other which is equal to or less than 10° .

Art Unit: 2879

11. With regard to claim 9, in figures 3 and 4, Tiesler-Wittig discloses a vehicle headlamp (40) comprising a reflector (42) and a metal halide lamp (10) as claimed in claim 1 [0041].

12. With regard to claim 10, in figures 1, 1a, 2 and 2a, Tiesler-Wittig discloses that the portions (30) forming the negative lenses are oriented in the direction of portions of the reflector (42) creating a cut-off between the illuminated area and the glare area according to requirements for automotive passing beam patterns [0041-0052].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiesler-Wittig as applied to claim 1 above, in view of itself.

15. With regard to claim 3, all of the limitations are disclosed by Tiesler-Wittig, as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, except Tiesler-Wittig does not expressly disclose that the portion forming the negative lens comprises a flat surface. However, Tiesler-Wittig teaches that the purpose of lens elements (30) is to optically alter the image of the light source in order to alter the light distribution properties of the light reflected and projected in front of a vehicle [0013-0016].

16. As taught by Tiesler-Wittig, one having ordinary skill in the art would understand that the portion forming the negative lens could comprise a flat surface to optically

Art Unit: 2879

alter the image of the light source in a preferred way, to improve the light distribution properties of the lamp.

17. Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the lamp disclosed in Tiesler-Wittig characterized in that the portion forming the negative lens comprises a flat surface, in order to optically alter the image of the light source so that the light distribution properties of the lamp are improved, as taught by Tiesler-Wittig.

18. With regard to claim 4, all of the limitations are disclosed by Tiesler-Wittig, as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, except Tiesler-Wittig does not expressly disclose that the portion forming the negative lens comprises a curved surface which is less curved than the curvature of the remainder of the outer bulb. However, Tiesler-Wittig teaches that the purpose of lens elements (30) is to optically alter the image of the light source in order to alter the light distribution properties of the light reflected and projected in front of a vehicle [0013-0016].

19. As taught by Tiesler-Wittig, one having ordinary skill in the art would understand that that the portion forming the negative lens could comprise a curved surface which is less curved than the curvature of the remainder of the outer bulb to optically alter the image of the light source in a preferred way, to improve the light distribution properties of the lamp.

20. Therefore, at the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the lamp disclosed in Tiesler-Wittig characterized in that the portion forming the negative lens comprises a curved surface

Art Unit: 2879

which is less curved than the curvature of the remainder of the outer bulb, in order to optically alter the image of the light source so that the light distribution properties of the lamp are improved, as taught by Tiesler-Wittig.

21. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiesler-Wittig as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, in view of Vitt et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0156984 A1.

22. All of the limitations of claim 8 are disclosed by Tiesler-Wittig, as discussed in the rejection of claim 5 above, including that the outer bulb functions to alter the emission from the discharge vessel, including to filter out UV radiation [0003]. However, Tiesler-Wittig does not expressly disclose that at least one of the portions forming the negative lens has anti-reflective properties. Vitt, in figures 11a-c, teaches a glass coating that provides for UV filter and anti-reflective properties, in order to ensure high efficiency of emission of visible light.

23. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to construct the Tiesler-Wittig lamp with the coating, taught by Vitt, so that at least one of the portions forming the negative lens has anti-reflective properties. This coating would provide highly efficient emission of visible light.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant has not supplemented the arguments submitted with Applicant's Amendment After Final of December 22, 2008. The Advisory Action, sent January 21, 2009, addressed these arguments.

Art Unit: 2879

25. In the Amendment After Final Applicant argues that the prior art of record, Tiesler-Wittig (U.S. 2003/0031026), does not fully anticipate claim 1 because it fails to teach or suggest a negative lens. Applicant further explains that in the art a negative lens produces virtual images of a light discharge that is a reduced, or negative, version of the light discharge. According to Dictionary.com, a negative lens is a "diverging lens." According to the Photonics Dictionary at Photonics.com, a negative lens is the same as a diverging lens which is defined as "A lens that causes parallel light rays to spread out. The lens surfaces may be plano-concave, double concave or concavo-convex. The edge of a diverging lens is always thicker than the center." These definitions of a "negative lens" are somewhat broader than the definition suggested by applicant.

26. Based on this broader definition, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the lens disclosed by Tiesler-Wittig must be at least partially shaped as a negative lens in order to shift the virtual location of the discharge, as explained in the Final Office Action. The narrower definition of "negative lens," suggested by applicant, would limit the claim and be contrary to the general principles that claims should be given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, and that limitations from the specification should not be read into the claims (MPEP 2111). No "official notice" has been taken or is necessary. Further a showing of inherency is not necessary. Being at least partially a negative lens is not an inherent property of the Tiesler-Witting lens which must be proven with further evidence. It is an explicit property of the Tiesler-Witting lens as evidenced by the express treatment of the light passing through the lens. The fact that it is the words "negative lens" are not used by Tiesler-Witting does not alter

Art Unit: 2879

the express nature of the lens. For these reasons, Applicant's Argument is not found to be persuasive.

Conclusion

27. This is Continued Examination of applicant's Application. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

28. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Hollweg whose telephone number is (571) 270-1739. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30am-5:00pm E.S.T..

Art Unit: 2879

30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

31. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TH/

/NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2879